Application Serial No.: 09/591,687 Attorney Docket No.: 47004.000074

Applicant's representative discussed with Examiner Dinh that U.S. Patent No. 5,963,915 to Kirsch fails to teach or suggest the claimed invention, as recited in claims 1 and 7. Accordingly, Applicant submits that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as set forth in the Office Action is unsupportable.

Claim 1 recites a method for accessing one of a plurality of remote service providers across a network via a single login to a host service provider, each of the plurality of remote service providers being accessible through the host service provider and each of the plurality of remote service providers having separate login procedures requiring data, the method comprising the steps of the host service provider receiving the single login from a user, the host service provider having a universal session manager; the universal session manager retrieving data from a validation database based on the single login to the host service provider, wherein the data is effective for accessing a selected one of the plurality of remote service providers, and wherein the data is based at least in part on the single login; the universal session manager transmitting said data to the remote service provider, the universal session manager and the remote service provider exchanging the data to effect a two-sided authentication; and the host service provider directing the user to the remote service provider.

As discussed in the Interview and in the July 9, 2003 Amendment, Kirsch fails to teach or suggest each and every feature as set forth in claim 1, including the interrelationship between the recited components. For example, claim 1 sets forth the features of a host service provider receiving a single login from a user, the host service provider, the universal session manager, the validation database and the plurality of remote service providers that are each accessible through the host service provider.

2

The teachings of Kirsch are deficient in supporting the asserted rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102 for various reasons as discussed in the Interview and in the July 9, 2003 Amendment. For example, the Office Action asserts that Kirsch discloses a method for accessing one of a plurality of remote service providers across a network via a single login to a host service provider (14 fig. 1). However, Kirsch's component 14 is simply the Internet as described in Kirsch in column 5, lines 51-67. Kirsch's component 14 cannot be fairly interpreted to teach the claimed host service provider.

Also, the Office Action asserts that the service provider has a universal session manager (i.e., the client computer system requesting a Web page by issuing a URL request through Internet to the server system). That is, the Office Action appears to be clearly referring to the client computer system 12 as constituting the universal session manager. However, such interpretation clearly falls short of teaching the claimed features of "the host service provider receiving the single login from a user, the host service provider having a universal session manager", as recited in claim 1.

In particular, in view of such deficiencies and as was discussed in the Interview, Applicant requests that the Examiner clearly specify the particular components of Kirsch that allegedly constitute the claimed "universal session manager" and the "validation database." It is submitted that in particular Kirsch fails to teach such claimed features and accordingly fails to support the asserted rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102.

Further, in the Interview, the Examiner asserted that databases are commonly and routinely associated with servers. Applicant of course acknowledges that such arrangement of servers and databases is well known. However, the features of claim 1, including the validation database, recite more than the general concept of a database used with a server. That is, claim 1

3

Application Serial No.: 09/591,687   Attorney Docket No.: 47004.000074

recites specific features relating to, for example, the host service provider, the universal session manager and the validation database, as well as the interrelationship between such claimed components of claim 1.

Additionally, the features of claims 19-21 were discussed in the Interview. Claims 19-21 were added by the July 9, 2003 Amendment. Claims 19 and 21 relate to further features of the universal session manger and the validation database. Claim 20 further recites the interrelationship between the user and the host service provider.

Also, in the Interview the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103 was discussed. In particular, it was discussed that Applicant traverses the rejection of claims 16 and 18 since the Office Action relies collectively on the teachings of Kirsch in the "Background of the Invention" and in the invention of Kirsch, but provides no motivation, or even acknowledgment, that such teachings of the "Background of the Invention" of Kirsch have effectively been combined with the teachings of Kirsch's invention - in an attempt to teach Applicant's claimed invention. Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection is improper in taking these disparate teachings of Kirsch and combining such teachings without acknowledgment or motivation, i.e., so as to allegedly teach the two-sided authentication and triple handshake in the particular claimed environment of claim 16, for example.

Accordingly, for at least the above reasons that were discussed in the Interview, as well as the reasons set forth in the July 9, 2003 Amendment, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 1, as well as claim 7, defines patentable subject matter. Claims 2-6 and 9-21 variously depend from independent claims 1 and 7 and therefore also define patentable subject matter for the reasons set forth above with respect to claims 1 and 7, as well as for the additional

4